From: Beck, Whitney [beck.whitney@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/20/2020 7:44:47 PM
To: Calli, Rosemary [Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov]
CC: Laycock, Kelly [Laycock.Kelly@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: projected public comment categories

Hi Rosemary,

Apologies, I wasn't able to access the sharepoint document for some reason, but here is my quick feedback (with some summary of what we talked about this morning):

Think about how to handle program description comments- some topics separately listed as their own comment category are nested under program description, and some are not. Would comments on topics that don't have their own category go under program description (e.g., staff/resources), and other comments would go under the more specific topics (e.g., general permits)? Probably just want to make sure the contractors understand what goes into a program description so they can be aware of key words commenters might use.

Categories to consider adding: Individual permits (may get comments on the review process?), exemptions, public input, linkages to ERP program, general support/opposition for the program, economic impacts of the program, maybe a category on implementation considerations (but ideally any of those would go under more specific topics that already have categories).

Best,
Whitney

From: Calli, Rosemary <Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 4:55 PM
To: Hicks, Matt <Hicks.Matthew@epa.gov>; Nagrani, Kavita <Nagrani.Kavita@epa.gov>; Creswell, Michael <Creswell.Michael@epa.gov>; Hurld, Kathy <Hurld.Kathy@epa.gov>; Beck, Whitney <beck.whitney@epa.gov>; Kupchan, Simma <Kupchan.Simma@epa.gov>; Wade, Alexis <Wade.Alexis@epa.gov>; Speir, Jeffrey <speir.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Morgan, James <Morgan.James@epa.gov>; Parker, Christopher <Parker.Christopher@epa.gov>; Mcgill, Thomas <Mcgill.Thomas@epa.gov>
Cc: Laycock, Kelly <Laycock.Kelly@epa.gov>
Subject: projected public comment categories

Hello, all – I started an outline of categories we can anticipate public comments to fall into for assumption. The contractor supporting docket management will use these to set up their comment management system. Your input on other categories we anticipate to get feedback in would be appreciated. It doesn't need to be perfect or exhaustive, as we'll be able to adjust later, but passing along a solid starter list next week would help with preparations.
- Let's keep the categories fairly high level like those already on the list. I understand from those who have been through this before that subdividing a lot complicates things and makes it more difficult to manage.
- I included the key elements of the program submission, the program requirements in Part 233 (~header level), and topics of interest (that I could remember) identified by stakeholders and during Florida's rulemaking.
- I'm copying the draft list in below for quick review – if it looks good, no need to go to SharePoint. If you have additions, please do put them in the linked file.

Thanks, everybody,
Rosemary

1. Program submission elements
    a. Governor's letter
    b. Program description
    c. General Counsel's (maybe also referred to as Attorney General's) statement
    d. EPA-FDEP MOA
    e. Corps-FDEP MOA
    f. State statutes & regulations
2. General permits
3. Permit duration/Projects longer than 5 years/Conceptual planning documents
4. Compliance evaluation
5. Enforcement
6. EPA oversight of permitting
    a. General
    b. Draft general permits
    c. Discharges with reasonable potential for affecting endangered or threatened species
    d. Discharges with reasonable potential for adverse impacts on waters of another state or tribe
7. Tribal consultation
8. NHPA consultation
9. ESA consultation
10. Jurisdiction
    a. Corps vs state jurisdiction
    b. Effect of new NWPR
11. Delineation methodology

Rosemary (Hall) Calli
Section Chief, Wetlands & Streams Regulatory Section
Aquatic Ecotoxicologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV

404.562.9846
Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov